

To: Schmittziel, Paula[Schmittziel.Paula@epa.gov]
From: Holmes, Mike
Sent: Wed 8/28/2013 10:35:55 PM
Subject: FW: Final for Upper Animas May Results Maps
Copy of UpperAnimas ARSG Format 18 Jun 13 0712-3.xlsx

From: William Simon [mailto:[Personal Email/Ex. 6](#)]
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 2:48 PM
To: Holmes, Mike; 'Peter Butler'
Cc: Way, Steven
Subject: RE: Final for Upper Animas May Results Maps

Mike, the format is *nearly* perfect. Somehow they added two columns, one is AI which is redundant and the other is an extra blank column in the EB position. I have inserted the actual ARSG format down the page into rows 148 and 149. In correcting the two mistakes I mention above they will be modifying my ARSG format entry so they need to realize that. AI and EB columns are highlighted in dark red with comment inserted in the row immediately above. It's probably best they make the correction rather than me as the next sample period will automatically be correct then.

Best of luck with retirement. You'll always be welcome to participate or just show up with ARSG or myself.

Bill

From: Holmes, Mike [mailto:Holmes.Michael@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:44 PM
To: Peter Butler; 'William Simon'
Cc: Way, Steven
Subject: RE: Final for Upper Animas May Results Maps

Sorry for the confusion Peter. I'll try to get things clarified before I am out of here the end of the week.

Bill: was the format for the May sampling data I sent a couple weeks ago OK?

Mike

From: Peter Butler [mailto:] **Personal Email/Ex. 6**
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2013 4:53 PM
To: Holmes, Mike; 'William Simon'
Cc: Way, Steven
Subject: RE: Final for Upper Animas May Results Maps

Mike – I'm finally getting to the Animas Maps. The maps you sent on Aug. 21st look exactly the same as the maps you sent us on Aug. 6th. None of my comments were addressed. Maybe there isn't data to address them, but if not, the data doesn't look very useful. Here are the comments I sent several weeks ago again.

Mike. Several comments:

There is no Gold King #7 level data.

Why is there no flow data (or load data) from the Mogul?

CC18 shows a zinc load of 410 lbs/day (I assume that's the right units.), CC21 (just below the confluence with South Cement Creek) shows 633 lbs and there are no known large sources in between. I remember this was an issue in last May's data as well. CC21B which is just above Prospect Gulch shows 435 lbs.

The location of CC48 is incorrect.

There appears to be a problem with flow data from the four gages. The flow and hence zinc load from M34, A68, and CC48 is 50% higher than the flow and zinc load data at A72.

That's all I caught in my first look.

From: Holmes, Mike [<mailto:Holmes.Michael@epa.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 2:09 PM
To: Peter Butler; William Simon
Cc: Way, Steven
Subject: FW: Final for Upper Animas May Results Maps

From: Holmes, Mike
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 7:32 PM
To: Holmes, Mike
Subject: FW: Final for Upper Animas May Results Maps

From: Bahnfleth, Ryan
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 10:20 PM
To: Holmes, Mike; Wall, Dan; Wieber, John
Subject: Final for Upper Animas May Results Maps

Hello,

Attached are the Finalized maps for the Upper Animas May 2013 Results mapping project.
Please contact me with any questions or concerns.

Thank you,

Ryan M. Bahnfleth

ESAT GIS Task Lead

U.S. EPA Region 8 Contractor

Golden, CO

303.312.7723

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 2013.0.3392 / Virus Database: 3211/6615 - Release Date: 08/28/13